## Case 1:13-cr-00340-RJS Document 239 Filed 10/14/14 Page 1 of 34

E8TFBASS Sentence 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 13 CR 340 (RJS) V. 5 STEPHEN BASCIANO, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. August 29, 2014 9 2:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 REBECCA MERMELSTEIN 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 JOSHUA DRATEL, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

(In open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States v. Stephen Basciano. Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rebecca Mermelstein for the government.

THE COURT: Ms. Mermelstein, good afternoon to you.

And for the defendant?

MR. DRATEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Joshua Dratel for Mr. Basciano who is beside me.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Dratel. Mr. Basciano, good afternoon as well. And family and friends are here. I recognize a few of them from before. Welcome. This is public so everybody is welcome here. Some of you have written me letters. It's very helpful to get letters of that sort.

We're here for sentencing. Mr. Basciano pled guilty before me on February 19. I want to go over with the parties what I have received in connection with sentencing and of course if I have left anything out you should let me know.

I have reviewed, first of all, the transcripts of the guilty plea proceeding that took place on February 19. I presided over the proceedings so I was here, but I think it's a good practice to review them before sentencing, so I've done that. I also have reviewed the presentence report that was prepared by the probation department. It's dated July 2. The

report itself is 25 pages single spaced, it includes a sentencing recommendation. I have reviewed that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have reviewed the government's sentencing letter dated June 23rd, which is a six-page letter, single spaced. Ι have reviewed Mr. Dratel's June 25th sentencing submission. is a 24-page, single-spaced submission and it includes assorted attachments all of which are letters from friends and family members as I mentioned before. I have reviewed a July 7 letter from Mr. Dratel which is one sentence long. It just attaches the original signed versions of letters that were included in the prior submission. So I have that. That didn't really add anything but it's good to have the signed originals. And then I have reviewed also the August 25th submission of Mr. Dratel which is a four-page, single-spaced submission that also includes a letter from Mr. Basciano which is two pages, single spaced, handwritten, very well written, I should say, for which I thank you, Mr. Basciano. You didn't have to do that, but I thank you, it was thoughtful.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: That's what I have received in connection with sentencing. Am I missing anything?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor.

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's start with the presentence report.

Mr. Dratel, you received a copy of the presentence report?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor.

Have you reviewed it with your client? THE COURT:

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to it?

MR. DRATEL: We stated some objections in our letter and the final report incorporates some changes. I don't know if they change any procedural aspects with respect to guideline levels except with respect to 2D1.1 which was prior to the Sentencing Commission's decision on retroactivity. According to the report it doesn't address the 2D1.1.

THE COURT: I'm not sure the Probation Department's position is going to change or has changed as a result of the retroactivity. The Sentencing Commission has recommended certain amendments. They've also voted to make those amendments apply retroactively. Neither goes into effect unless and until Congress acts through inactivity. of a perverse thing. Congress has between now and November to decide whether to take steps to affirmatively reject the If they do nothing, then the amendments go into proposals. effect and that would result in a two-level reduction.

The United States Attorney's Office has typically taken the position that the two levels should apply now, that he shouldn't have to wait, unless there are certain aggravating circumstances and in the sentencings of other defendants in this case the government has taken the view that the two-level

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reduction shouldn't be applied because the defendants have ties to organized crime. I think the government no longer has that In light of the retroactivity, in light of some additional discussions within the Department of Justice they are no longer taking that position. They are now consistently across the board taking the position that the drug quidelines should be reduced by two levels.

Is that accurate here, Ms. Mermelstein?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: That's correct, your Honor, I put in my submission before the government changed its position but you're exactly right.

THE COURT: I'm getting ahead of myself here, I My only view is, frankly, we should wait for suppose. amendments to go into effect before we apply them, but because many judges including myself in other cases have applied the lower guidelines in anticipation of the amendment, I don't think there's any reason to not do the same here. So I'm going to apply the two-level reduction. So that I think is off the The other objections that you had were with respect to table. characterizations of facts in prior arrests that you dispute. Probation stands behind the facts that they had. I don't think it's going to affect the sentencing at all. We could perhaps talk about that as well. I'm allowed to consider facts that took place even if they weren't proven in other cases, proven beyond a reasonable doubt, but it may be that I would have to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

make a factual finding that they were established by a preponderance of the evidence, if I apply that here. I don't think we have to do that here but we'll cross that bridge when we come to it. Other than that, you have no objections?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Mermelstein, you reviewed the report. Do you have any objections?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So that's the presentence report. Mr. Basciano, when you pled quilty I told you there were different factors that the judge had to take into account in deciding sentence. Do you recall that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: One of the factors I mentioned was the United States sentencing quidelines that we spoke about a little bit today. Remember this big book?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I think I pointed that out to you and you and some of the others who were there on that day remember that this is a book that some judges and lawyers and academicians put together and what it does is provide guidance to judges like me. Judges are to look at this book, go to pages that apply, make findings of facts and certain conclusions based on that. For every crime and type of crime there's a chapter in So the judge is required to go to that chapter. this book. So

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in this case which relates to a narcotics offense the judge is required to go to Section 2D1.1 in this manual and make findings including the type of drug involved, amount of drug involved, those sorts of things. The judge has to look up certain things that relate to role in the offense and some other things and through that process of addition and subtraction the judge comes up with a number and that number is known as the offense level. The judge then goes to another chapter in the book that relates to criminal history and for that chapter the judge is asked to consider whether the defendant has prior convictions, if so, did it result in jail sentences, if so, what were those sentences and depending on the answers to those questions the judge assigns points and comes up with another number, that number being referred to as the criminal history category. There are six categories. Category I is the lowest, category IV is the highest and most The judge is then told to take those two numbers, the offense level on the one hand, the criminal history category on the other, and go in the back of in book where there's a table or rating and the judge goes down this table to the far left, offense level, stops at the one appropriate. The judge goes across the other columns to the right, stops at the column that's appropriate for criminal history category and what the judge finds is the range that the commission recommends.

I don't have to follow this. I do have to consider

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have to make my findings according to the book and state what the range is but there are other factors I have to consider as well. So we're going to spend a few minutes talking about this book and how it applies in this case. I do that, state the range, then we'll talk about the other factors.

I apologize for the acoustics. We have some new microphones. It's a beautiful courtroom. The acoustics are challenging, so we have new microphones. They were designed to enhance the ability to be heard. They're working okay, but every once in a while we get some feedback which kinds of makes you feel like a dog hearing a whistle, so it's irritating, but we'll deal with that as we go.

So for the sentencing guidelines the presentence report sets forth the views of the probation office beginning on the very bottom of page 9, but for the most part on page 10 through page 12. The base offense level based on the amount and type of drugs, which is marijuana, at least 80 kilograms, not more than 100 kilograms, is level 24. Now, I recall certainly at the time of the quilty plea there was some dispute as to what the amount of marijuana was. Mr. Basciano at least initially thought it was less than a hundred kilos but wasn't really sure, so I just want to be sure everyone is on board that this is the quantity, 80 to 100 kilograms?

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: And the government is?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I have no reason to dispute that so I will adopt that finding. Level 24 is the base offense level.

Mr. Basciano, there's no enhancements. There's a three-level reduction because you accepted responsibility and accepted, pled guilty well in advance of trial so pursuant to Section 3E1.1 a three-level reduction is appropriate. That puts him at level 21. Mr. Basciano is in criminal history category III. He has three prior convictions; one for assault, two for aggravated unlicensed operation of a motor vehicle. I guess he was also on parole at the time of this offense, so that results in a total of six criminal history points, criminal history category III. So offense level 21, criminal history category III puts the range at 46 to 57 which is what the probation department found.

By virtue of the amendment that has not yet taken place, not gone into effect yet but is likely to, in which the government and the defense lawyers and other lawyers assume to be going through, I'm going to reduce by another two levels the offense level. So that puts us at level 19, criminal history category III, which is a guidelines range of 37 to 46 months. It's an odd number. That's three years and one month up to three years and eight months. So that's the range. I think somebody in the submission had suggested that it was 36 months

1 at the bottom end, but it says 37.

MR. DRATEL: 37.

THE COURT: 37. Okay. So that's my finding with respect to the sentencing guidelines. Does anybody object to what I just said?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So, as I said, there's no magic to the guidelines. That's one thing you think about. Do you need a minute?

MR. DRATEL: Just one second, your Honor.

(Pause)

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So there are other factors,

Mr. Basciano, that I mentioned to you before you pled guilty
and these are factors that a Court has to consider along with
the guidelines in fashioning sentence. Those factors include
your own personal history, the facts and circumstances of your
life and your birth to the present, which like everybody's life
is complicated. There are a lot of different things that have
gone on in your life and they're all relevant to figuring out
what's the appropriate sentence. I have to tailor the sentence
here to you as a person and that means considering the
circumstances of your birth, your early childhood, your
educational background, your work history, your criminal

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

history to be sure. Other factors like family circumstances today. So I will consider all those things, naturally.

I also have to consider the facts and circumstances of This is a serious crime, obviously. this crime. sentence that I impose has to reflect the seriousness of the It has to be a just punishment for the crime. And that crime. means not just what the crime is called but what the crime entailed, what you did, what others did, for how long a period of time, for what kind of money, with what kind of effect. Those are all relevant factors to be considered in fashioning, in tailoring the sentence. The sentence is designed to promote respect for the law and that requires a balancing. Other factors that I'm required to consider include the need to deter or discourage you and others from committing crimes in the future, the hope being that by imposing a sentence on you I'll send a message to you and perhaps to other people who might be considering engaging in criminal conduct in the future and hopefully on the basis of this sentence they'll say, oh, it's not worth it, forget it and at the end of the day there will be less crime than there would have been had I sentenced you to a lower sentence. Hard to know with any precision whether that's true, but that's the thinking and I think most of us know there's something to it. So that's a factor I have to take into account.

I also have to consider your own needs while you're in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

People with medical conditions, mental health custody. conditions, substance abuse treatment needs, all of those things have to be considered by the judge in fashioning a sentence. And then I guess the last factor that I'm required to consider and will consider is the need to avoid what's referred to as unwarranted disparity between the sentence in this case and other similar cases for a similar offense and the point is it would be wrong and probably would encourage less respect for the law if the sentence imposed here was wildly out of whack with sentences imposed on other defendants in cases that are similar to this one with histories that are similar to the defendant here. It's important that there be some rough equality across the system so that the system is perceived as unbiased, so I'll consider that. The hard part is balancing all these factors and that's my job in a nutshell.

What I'm going to do is hear from the lawyers. I'll start with Mr. Dratel. He's made a variety of points in his submission which was very lengthy, very characteristic of him. So I'll hear from Mr. Dratel on those and other points he wishes to make.

I'll hear from Ms. Mermelstein. I'll let her respond and make other points she thinks are relevant. After that I'll give you the opportunity to speak, if you'd like. You have the opportunity to speak. You've already written me a letter. You shouldn't feel you have to speak but if you'd like to you're

21

22

23

24

25

very welcome to and after that I will then tell you the sentence I will impose and my reasons for it. So, Mr. Dratel?

MR. DRATEL: Thank you, your Honor. And I won't go through all of the points that are in the submissions. I know the Court has read them and is considering them. The Court's initial remarks obviate the need for me to talk about the amendments. I'd like to speak about the letters from some of the people who are here, some people who are not here, but obviously it's a show of support for Mr. Basciano in terms of what the future holds for him in the sense of someone who when he does emerge from jail will have a support mechanism that obviously cares about him, cares about his future and from his letter the Court knows his family's view of the situation he's in, what got him here and where he will be once this is finished. So I think that's important in the context of projecting into the future for particular defendants as to what their current sentence is going to mean once it's expired. think Mr. Basciano's letter is very important, obviously in the context of where he sees himself now, where he sees the conduct that put him here and where he says himself in the future. much of this process in a certain sense, bears repetition, in case after case it's choreographed in a sense, but his letter It's his own, generated by him and him alone and it reflects his sincere position on where he's at and where he was at the time of his arrest.

2 bo 3 w. 4 tl 5 p.

I want to talk a little bit about criminal history because we talked about it a little bit in the papers but I want to expand on it in this sense in that a couple of mistakes that Mr. Basciano has made in the past and for which he has paid for with jail time continue to exert a significant impact on where he is in the guidelines in this case. And I think at some point that's been taken into account so it doesn't continually again and again result in punishment for something that he's already served a prison sentence for and something that just, there's no escape from, but at the same time I think it has to be factored in also particularly the kind of offense, the driving without a license, the 30-day sentence that puts him in category 3. I think the parole issue is also a technical one because it really relates to the length of the indictment going back to 2009.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that's what puts him in category III. In category III, he has three levels because of the assault and that's a pretty serious crime. He did some jail time for that one.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: He got two more points because he was on parole at the time he was involved in this criminal activity, so even without the driving offense he's in, he's got five criminal history points which puts him in category III.

MR. DRATEL: But I think the parole one is a technical

issue as well because even though the conspiracy starts in 2009, the plea agreement — because the presentence report went by the indictment which alleges from 2009 but the plea agreement discusses his participation from 2012 on and he's off supervision in 2011. So I think that's a technical issue which is one that again ameliorates or mitigates the criminal history category which is a technical matter either way.

THE COURT: I'm not sure of the facts then. Paragraph 26 of the presentence report talks about, "Stephen Basciano started Vincent Basciano's, Jr.'s marijuana route and sold the route to Vincent Basciano, Jr. while he was in jail in connection with a 2007 conviction for assault. Vincent Basciano, Jr. started operating the route in at least 2009 and paid Stephen Basciano a portion of the proceeds from the route. After Stephen Basciano got out of jail in 2009 he started selling marijuana a pound at a time to other customers. He purchased marijuana from Larca that Larca obtained from the marijuana shipments arranged by others." So according to paragraph 26 the activity doesn't begin in 2012, it begins in 2009.

MR. DRATEL: Right. That's what the indictment charges, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I don't know it's technical. I'm not sure I'm following the point you're making.

MR. DRATEL: Just that his plea was between, started

in 2012 to 2014. That's all -- I mean, 2013. I'm sorry. So it's just, it gets into category III regardless, but it's just an overlap that's not quite consistent in terms of the allegations. But I still think that even still that it's unusual with someone with a single felony to be in category III.

THE COURT: Well, if you commit the crime while you're on probation it's not unusual. The instant crime. I mean, I don't know. I guess it seems to me if you went to jail you get your three points, you commit another crime shortly after you get out while on probation you'll be in category III by definition. I don't think there's anything unusual about that. I know the guidelines didn't contemplate exactly this kind of scenario.

MR. DRATEL: Another factor also is the sentencing in terms of the 3553(a)(6), which is the disparity issue, the Court I think in this case has for some of the defendants has for the sentencings gone below the guidelines. Certainly the predominant trend in this district is below the guidelines for sentences generally and nationally for drug cases below the guidelines as well. And putting all those statistics — so I think a sentence below the guidelines is really more the norm by a large margin now particularly in a case like this than a guideline sentence.

THE COURT: You had something about that in your

letter. You certainly didn't carve out cooperation, so I think it's apples and oranges. It should be for non-cooperating cases what percentage fall within or outside the guidelines.

MR. DRATEL: For the vast majority, if you carve them out entirely it's still probably, in this district, 55 percent of all sentences. I'm trying to do the math right now. If you take out the 55 all together then you're talking about 80, talking about 85 percent of the cases, about 5/8ths, so you're looking at more than 60 percent would be below the guidelines still even if you carved out the 15 percent cooperator cases.

THE COURT: Well, there's a high percentage of them below the guidelines. I think we can agree on that.

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. But in every case it should be a fact intensive and very specific inquiry about the conduct. So the other defendants who have been sentenced who were part of this conspiracy, there are some of them doing a lot of time. Might be a little below the guidelines, but 108 months, nine years, nine and a half years, eight and a half years.

MR. DRATEL: But some a lot less, your Honor. So I think there's a --

THE COURT: Generally that's a function I think of quantity and the amount of time in the conspiracy. Joseph Basciano got a lower sentence, clearly, so did Dominick Ballucia.

MR. DRATEL: And Mr. Kokenyei also, I think he got a sentence below the guidelines certainly. I think his sentence was three years but I think that was considerably below his guidelines.

THE COURT: So, all right, but the mere fact of below the guidelines is less informative or instructive than what those folks did in this conspiracy relative to what Mr. Basciano did in the conspiracy.

MR. DRATEL: Well, Mr. Kokenyei was one grade higher in terms of the connection to the source. He was the person with the connection to California, I believe, so in this sense Mr. Basciano is one level below that in terms of a retail operation in that regard.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure being closer to the source is necessarily indicative of greater culpability. I always view it as sort of a horizontal chain as opposed to a vertical one, that every link is important and without a link the chain breaks. But I don't mean, is that undisputed that Mr. Kokenyei was closer to the source than Mr. Basciano, Ms. Mermelstein?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I suppose it depends on what you mean by closer to the source. Kokenyei traveled to California in connection with the conspiracy which this defendant didn't do.

THE COURT: But that's basically all the defendant

did.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Right, so he's a sort of middleman in the chain.

THE COURT: But for a very limited duration.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: For a shorter period of time. So I think your Honor's point is right — I think it's probably a fair characterization to say he's closer to the source. I'm just not sure that's a useful data point in terms of culpability.

THE COURT: Anyway, I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. Dratel. Go ahead.

MR. DRATEL: To a certain extent all sentences are apples and oranges because there are too many variables to compare the entirety of one person to another. But I think the balance of everything here would militate for a sentence well below the guideline that the Court has found and for all the reasons that we've talked about I again, I know the Court has looked at the papers, and I don't want to repeat them all but there are these issues of — also the time spent at MCC which has been difficult for Mr. Basciano. It's one of the reasons he wants to be sentenced now because he wants to be somewhere else other than MCC, because it's a rather difficult proposition for him to be on the floor he's on because it's replete with violence and just in terms of hygiene resources and even ordinary resources that when one is in a prison one is

supposed to have available.

Again, I know the Court has gone through this. I think in the context of the entirety of the case where the Court has sentenced people and where Mr. Basciano is and also taking into account very much also his letter which again, I think, is something that it's compelling in a -- I'm sorry, I'm getting some feedback here, maybe if I move it this way a little bit.

THE COURT: Maybe.

MR. DRATEL: It's compelling in the sense of where he sits now in his own mind and his acknowledgment of his mistakes, his recognition of what that means for himself, his family, his future, and where that puts him going forward. I think that's a watershed event for someone and I think that it demonstrates, again, the unnecessary, that a longer sentence is unnecessary. A guideline sentence or a sentence at or near the guidelines level is unnecessary in this case, that a below guidelines sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary. Those are the factors, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Mermelstein, anything you want to add or say in response to what Mr. Dratel just said?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I don't have a lot. I think the government has put forth its submissions and your Honor made some of the points that I would respond to Mr. Dratel with, which is to say, unlike the unlicensed operation of the motor

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vehicle which I think we would say is not a very serious crime, that is not what puts the defendant into category III, that's not why he's in that category, and I think it is proper that he is in this category. And it's very significant that he is in this category. It's hard to see this arrest as a watershed moment in this defendant's life because he's already served two years in prison on his first arrest. You would think that -that's a relatively long prison term, certainly for a state conviction, first offender, pretty serious prison term, and that in no way deterred his criminal conduct. He started this marijuana conspiracy before that conviction and continued when he got out of jail, while on parole, while under the supervision of the court and continued to engage in that criminal conduct and I think that's a basis to say two years did not deter this defendant. So some serious sentence is appropriate here. I think here the guidelines accomplish that. To say that statistically speaking many defendants get below quideline sentences, it can't be that as a result then for equitable reasons no one should get a guideline sentence and I think it depends so much on the facts of a particular case and the facts here are disconcerting. I think the phone calls cited in the government's submission are also disconcerting. Mr. Dratel reads them a different way as being a renunciation of the prior possession of firearms and the prior willingness to engage in violence, but, frankly, even if they're read that

way I think there are clearly firearms possessions by this defendant for which he was never arrested and never convicted and he purports to have shot at people, conduct which luckily doesn't appear to have ultimately resulted in someone being hit but is ultimately pretty dangerous with serious disregard for the law. So I think given the long-standing participation in the offense, serious nature of the offense, his participation before and after a very significant arrest I think a very significant sentence is necessary and appropriate here. I think the guidelines accomplish that purpose.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Do you want to respond, Mr. Dratel?

MR. DRATEL: Yes. One is that the assault occurred when Mr. Basciano was 21. He is now 30. I think his letter to the Court reflects a maturation process that was not present at the time he was 21 or even when he got out of prison at that point. Although he did mature significantly in that respect because what those conversations that Ms. Mermelstein refers to demonstrate is the change in his point of view about firearms after getting out of jail. He specifically says more than once on that tape and I've listened to them in their entirety very recently. He says it more than once, I thought that way before I went to jail and it was wrong. And he has changed and now, obviously, he's got another arrest, not involving firearms or anything to do with that, something else, but there's further

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

change. And the question is how much more jail time is required to get to the next level of maturation. I think time in and of itself has done that to a certain extent. his first time, obviously, in federal court, which I think is significantly different in the context of people's understanding of consequences for their acts and what the possibilities are for future wrongdoing and how that affects someone, and I think all of that is important in figuring out what the appropriate sentence is, and I think that it has to be calibrated. The question of statistics is not one of purely statistical analysis but it's about where the norm lies in the context of sentencing these days, in the sense that we existed for a significant period where the norm was the guidelines. Now the norm is not the quidelines. The norm is under the quidelines. And so I think that we have to acknowledge that and that a sentence should reflect that in the context of thinking about disparity, thinking about sentencing and thinking about sufficient but not greater than necessary. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right, Mr. Basciano I said you have a right to address the Court. You don't have to --

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to. Just a few short words. Since I've been in MCC I've had time to think. All my friends, vacations, everything they're doing I'm missing from selling marijuana. I just want to let you know that this will

never happen again. I learned my lesson. Just from seeing everything I'm missing I'll never risk my freedom again.

That's all I want to say.

THE COURT: All right. I'd like to take maybe five minutes to just think about what has been said today, collect my thoughts and then I'm going to come back and at that time I'll recite the sentence I intend to impose and explain my reasons and then go forward with sentencing. So about five minutes, if it's all right with you. Thanks.

(Recess)

I spend a lot of time on it, and it's important to be consistent and it's important to be thoughtful in how sentence is arrived at. And so one of the hallmarks in our system,

Mr. Basciano, is that judges have to give reasons and I think that's a good thing. I think it's helpful that the defendant, the defendant's family, the public never has to wonder what was going through the judge's mind. That it's all public, that the judge has an obligation to explain it. That's what I tend to do at these sentencings. Sometimes it feels like I'm giving a lecture, but it's not that, and it's certainly not a desire to wag my finger at anybody. It's just to explain what goes into a sentence of this kind. You're a human being with people who care about you, good qualities, and your letter shows a thoughtful person who has real talents and I think real

potential. I believe that.

There are, of course, other aspects to the sentencing that also have to be considered and that's the crime itself, the notion of just punishment, the effect it may have on future behavior and general deterrence. So these are the things that sort of come to mind in this case. I see this as being — marijuana I guess is a subject about which we're having a national conversation I suppose but this is not a case that involved medicinal marijuana or marriage being used for any other purpose other than for people getting high illegally and it was being done not for motives involving glaucoma but money, it was all done in an illicit drug trade just to get money through illegal means. That's what it was. In this case it went on for a very long time. It wasn't a one-shot thing.

We talked about Mr. Kokenyei who I gave 36 months to.
Mr. Kokenyei's role was to introduce people, to help a supplier
get together with somebody who wanted a supply but other than
an introduction it was in passing. In this case according to
what's in the presentence report, your role was much more
active. It began before you were in prison, it paused while
you were in prison and began again when you got out. It was
something you did consistently. It wasn't a one-shot, and I
think that that in terms of culpability that does make you more
culpable than some of the other defendants in this case. Your
brother, Joseph, got a much lighter sentence than anybody

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

because it seemed to me that he was involved in a much less serious way, almost as an afterthought and almost completely as a result of who he was and who he was related to, and my sense is that he sort of had been with a different family or been living in a different place he would have bypassed this altogether and I think the sentence has to reflect that. But you, according to what's in the presentence report, were a lot more active in this thing and I think that goes to culpability.

Valentine was another person I sentenced. I mean, he seemed more like you in the sense that he had a route, he was responsible for distributing marijuana in this area from loafs that he received from California. I gave him 72 months to reflect the fact that he had priors and reflect the fact that what he was doing was pretty serious and over a long period of There's no magic to these guidelines. They're largely carried by the amounts of drugs involved. They're criticized for overly focusing on the amount and I think that's fair, but I think the quantity often reflects culpability. Larger amounts of drugs usually makes you more culpable than a smaller amount of drugs but other functions, other factors, the role in the offense, not leadership versus minor participant, but just driver versus distributor versus introducer, I think those are the types of things that really aren't considered in the quidelines.

Duration in the offense is not really taken into

account by the guidelines. Seems to me a person who was involved for a very short period of time is less culpable generally than a person who was involved for a long period of time even though the amount is the same. So in your case I think it's the duration, it's the nature of the activity, the fact that you were involved before and after a serious term of imprisonment, that you should have recognized what you appear to recognize now. I think you should have recognized that at the time you were getting out of jail in your previous term so all of that persuades me a sentence below or even at the bottom end of the range isn't appropriate.

I think a sentence in this case of three and a half years is right. I'm not married to these guidelines. I use the guidelines for guidance, but ultimately I trust in my judgment and my judgment in this is that a three-and-a-half year term is appropriate particularly since you already served a two year term and it didn't seem to do the trick.

It's not to detract from what I said before. I think you're a decent guy. There's a future for you, but there has to be just punishment. That's one of the factors I have to consider. So all things considered I think a sentence of 42 months is an appropriate sentence. That's three-and-a-half years, as I said. I also will impose a term of supervised release of three years. I'm not going to impose a fine. Forfeiture has been agreed to I think by the parties, is that

right, \$600,000?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Dratel, you had asked me to order that the garnishment be the lowest possible. I usually leave that up to probation. Usually I think it's 15 percent from the gross income is the maximum they take out. I think it determines in large part whether and how much money Mr. Basciano will be making in legitimate employment when he gets out. So did you have something else in mind?

MR. DRATEL: Just to direct probation to not take the maximum amount. I mean, it's an extraordinarily onerous penalty.

THE COURT: It can be. It sort of depends on how much income a person has coming in. So let's leave it as this: If when Mr. Basciano gets out the forfeiture payments are perceived as high I'm certainly willing to revisit that. So you can take it up with probation in the first instance to say it could be lower and if they disagree you can send me a letter and I'll reconsider. I'm not looking to bury or handicap Mr. Basciano because he's looking to get his life back together. No one would do that. I think people may disagree on what's the appropriate amount and ultimately I get to make those decisions. So I will hear you, but I think really at this point I'm ordering forfeiture in the amount of \$600,000.

I'm not going to impose a fine, as I said. I will

order a special assessment of \$100 and ask you to pay immediately, Mr. Basciano and that's designed to help defray the costs of prosecution, the court costs. One hundred dollars is not a whole lot. That's a mandatory special assessment.

Is there any legal impediment to my imposing such a sentence?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor.

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Basciano, could I ask you to please stand? Mr. Basciano, having accepted your quilty plea back in February, I now sentence you as follows: I sentence you to a term of incarceration of three-and-a-half years, 42 months, with credit for the time you already served. I will also impose a term of supervised release of three years and will include the following mandatory special conditions: First, you shouldn't commit another federal, state or local crime of any kind. You shall not possess illegal narcotics or use illegal narcotics of any kind. That includes prescription drugs for which you don't have a prescription. You may not possess a firearm or destructive device of any kind. If you are near a gun, you've got to get out of town. You've got to get far away. You can't possess a gun, period. If you do it's a crime and you'll be looking at serious penalties, but also it will be a violation of your supervised release in this case and you will be subject to being resentenced here for up to three years

for the violation of your supervised release. I tell you that just because I really want to press on you that you can't be near guns at all. I think you get that message.

You will be tested for drugs twice, at least twice; once when you get out and shortly after that as the probation department thinks appropriate. So that will be part of your supervised release. You will also cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

There are 13 standard conditions. They apply to virtually every case involving supervised release. I will apply those here. In addition, there are special conditions I want to impose. They include, first of all, that you will provide probation with access to any requested financial information. You will not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer. This is to insure you are not getting over your head financially which would put you in a situation where you would be tempted to make bad decisions that could put you back into trouble. That's the reason for those conditions.

In addition to that you will also submit your person, your residence, place of business, your vehicle or any other premises that you control, they will be subject to a search in the event the probation officer believes there's some evidence of a crime or evidence of a violation of supervised release. That search will have to be done in a reasonable way at a

reasonable time, but you will not have the ability to just say, "No, thanks, I don't want to do this." If you refuse or otherwise obstruct the search that would be a violation of your supervised release. One other thing I want to be sure you understand, to the extent that you share premises with someone, you have a girlfriend who obviously you're planning a future with, you have to let her know her things as well will be subject to a search merely due to the fact that she's living with you and sharing a premises with you. So you have to let her or anyone else with whom you share a premises, you have to let them know that.

You will be supervised in the office of your residence. You're planning to live in the Southern District, I think, right here in the Bronx or nearby, so you'll be supervised in this district. I'm going to ask you to report to the nearest probation office within 24 hours from your release of custody. So the day you come out you'll come home, celebrate. That will be a nice day. It will be a happy day. But the very next day I want you to go to probation to get your supervision lined up unless the next day is a holiday or a weekend, then on the next business day. Okay? All right. As I said, I'm not going to impose a fine. I will order forfeiture in the amount of \$600,000 pursuant to the agreement of the parties and I will order the \$100 special assessment.

Now, are there open counts?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: There's an underlying indictment which the government moves to dismiss.

THE COURT: So I dismiss the open counts of the underlying indictment.

I should tell you, Mr. Basciano, you have the right to appeal this sentence to the extent you haven't already waived that right. I think you may have. I think the way that the agreement you entered into with the government was lined up it says that if I sentenced you to 57 months or anything less than 57 months you agreed you won't appeal the sentence. Since I gave you 42 months I think you probably waived your right to appeal. But if you think you have a basis to appeal, talk to Mr. Dratel. You should file a notice of appeal within two weeks. Those deadlines are pretty strict so make sure you get those in on time within two weeks. Okay? Mr. Dratel, are there any recommendations you'd like me to make to Bureau of Prisons?

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor, that Mr. Basciano be located to a facility as close as possible to New York and the Court recommend that he be enrolled in the BOP's substance abuse program.

THE COURT: I notice that in your letter now that you raise it but it seemed to me in the presentence report it sounded to me as if there really wasn't a drug problem here.

MR. DRATEL: I think there's marijuana use and --

THE COURT: It didn't seem that there was anything other than that. So what I'm referring to is paragraph 79. It says, "Defendant initially smoked marijuana at age 20 with friends. He used it a total of approximately ten times. He ceased smoking marijuana in 2011. The defendant disclaimed the use of any other type of illicit drugs or prescription medications. Began consuming alcohol at 21. Drank once or twice a month but not to excess." So it doesn't seem to me that there was any basis to think that there was a drug problem here. Is there more to the story that I'm missing?

MR. DRATEL: No, your Honor, I just think that my experience is that the use of illegal substances, it qualifies the defendant for enrollment in these programs.

THE COURT: Well, look, to the extent he qualifies, that's certainly something the Bureau of Prisons can consider. I'm not going to recommend one way or the other. Usually I make a recommendation in the case where someone has a demonstrated abuse problem. I don't see that here. In fact, almost to the contrary, so I will respectfully decline to make that recommendation. But I will recommend that he serve his time in a facility near to his family as possible. I can't order that, but generally the Bureau of Prisons tries to accommodate those recommendations, so I will recommend it in the strongest terms. This is a tough day for the defendant, for the family. I get that. I think Mr. Basciano is a person

who seems to have learned his lesson. His letter reflects that. So my hope is that, Mr. Basciano, that never again will you be in a courtroom and the rest of your life is spent making up to your family and yourself — you don't deserve this. This is no way to live. You should be out there living a life that you and others can be proud of. That's my hope for you. When you get out you will be supervised by a probation officer and the probation officer is hoping for the best for you, as we all are. So let him provide that. Probation can be helpful. They can help with job placement, with training opportunities. Those are all things that you should employ. Don't even wait until you get out. You could start today to make plans of how you're going to make a living, and how you're going to live that out in concrete fashion.

So thanks to all who came here today, for your taking the time to write letters, I appreciate that as well. You may be disappointed, you may have been hoping for a lower sentence, I don't know. I call them the way I see here. But hopefully you're sitting here and thinking the system was fair and was thoughtful and wasn't mean spirited or petty in any way. If that was the case it would diminish everyone's respect for the system and wouldn't be a good thing.

All right, so thanks to the marshal and thanks to the court reporter and I wish everybody a good day.

(Adjourned)